UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION 1:19-cv-00333-MR

PAUL VALDEZ-BEY,	
Plaintiff,	
vs.	ORDER
FNU CASTALONE, et al.,	
Defendants.	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's filing. [Doc. 35].

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on December 3, 2019 against Defendants FNU Castalone, FNU Patton, and FNU Sims, based on events alleged to have occurred while he was detained at the Buncombe County Detention Center located in Asheville, North Carolina. [Doc. 1]. Plaintiff's Complaint survived initial review as to all Defendants. [Doc. 17]. After some delay, Plaintiff filed completed summonses with the Court for service on Defendants. [See Docs. 19, 21, 22, 23, 25; 10/28/2020 Docket Entry]. Summonses were issued electronically to the United States Marshal for service on all Defendants on November 2, 2020. [Doc. 26]. On December 3, 2020, the United States Marshal filed a receipt, indicating that the summonses were served on Defendants by certified mail on November

5, 2020. [Doc. 29]. On November 30, 2020, Defendants Castalone and Patton answered Plaintiff's Complaint. [Doc. 28]. On March 30, 2021, because Defendant Sims had not appeared or otherwise defended this action and because Plaintiff had not taken any action with respect to Defendant Sims, the Court ordered Plaintiff to take action to prosecute the case against Sims within 14 days of its Order. [Doc. 33]. Shortly thereafter, Defendant Sims filed an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint. [Doc. 34].

Now before the Court is Plaintiff's filing, which he calls "Notice for 'Sims" and which appears to be in response to the Court's Order directing Plaintiff to take further action to prosecute this case against Defendant Sims. [Doc. 35]. In this document, Plaintiff states, "[a]s stated the defendant Sims has a required time to Answer to these accusations or failure to do so will result in automatic win for me...." [Id.]. The Court declines to consider this filing and will strike it from the record in this matter.¹

As Plaintiff was expressly directed in the Order of Instructions mailed to him on December 31, 2019, documents Plaintiff files with the Court must include the case number at the top of the first page and should be properly captioned. [See Doc. 6 at ¶ 4]. Further, Plaintiff was instructed that, "[o]nly

¹ The Court notes for the sake of judicial economy that to the extent Plaintiff intended to seek entry of default through the instant filing it would be denied, in any event, because Defendant Sims has now answered the Complaint.

documents properly filed with the Clerk of Court will be docketed in this case." [Id.]. Plaintiff has been previously cautioned against filing improper documents in this case. [See Docs. 31, 32]. Should Plaintiff file documents in this case in the future that fail to comply with the Clerk's instructions, they will be summarily dismissed and/or stricken.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's filing [Doc. 35] is hereby **STRICKEN** from the record in this matter.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff need take no further action directly in response to Docket No. 33.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: March 29, 20

Martin Reidinger

Chief United States District Judge